1		
2		
3		
4	UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
5	NORTHERN DIS	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6 7 8 9	GERARD A MCHALE,  Plaintiff,  v.	Case No. <u>10-cv-04864-JCS</u>
10	SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP,  Defendant.	
11	Defendant.	
12 13 14 15	COURT'S PROI	POSED VERDICT FORM
17		
18		
18 19		
18 19 20		
18 19 20 21		
18 19 20 21 22		
18 19 20 21 22 23	Dated: September 12, 2013	
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Dated: September 12, 2013	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Dated: September 12, 2013	JOSEPH C. SPERO United States Magistrate Judge

United States District Court Northern District of California 1. Do you find that Plaintiff GERARD A. McHALE, P.A., TRUSTEE OF THE 1031 DEBTORS LIQUIDATING TRUST (the "BANKRUPTCY TRUSTEE"), has proved by the preponderance of the evidence that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP was negligent?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

If your answer to Question 1 is "Yes," please answer Question 2. If your answer to Question 1 is "No," do not answer any further questions. Please have the Jury Foreperson sign and date this Verdict Form and return it to Ms. Karen Hom.

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

26

27

28

1

2.	Do you find that BANKRUPTCY TRUSTEE has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP's negligence was a substantial factor in causing harm to 1031 Advance?			
	Yes	No		

If your answer to Question 2 is "Yes," please answer Question 3. If your answer to Question 2 is "No," do not answer any further questions. Please have the Jury Foreperson sign and date this Verdict Form and return it to Ms. Karen Hom.

•
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 2	3. Do you find that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the criminal conduct of Edward Okun was a superseding cause of 1031 Advance's damage?
3	
4	Yes No
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	If your answer to Question 3 is "No," please answer Question 4. If your answer to Question
18	3 is "Yes," do not answer any further questions. Please have the Jury Foreperson sign and date
19	this Verdict Form and return it to Ms. Karen Hom.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

4.	What amount of money do you find to be the monetary damage sustained by 1031
	Advance, Inc. which the BANKRUPTCY TRUSTEE has proved by the
	preponderance of the evidence?

Please answer Question 5.

1	5. Comparative fault: Do you find that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that 1031 Advance was negligent?
2	
3	Yes No
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	If your answer to Question 5 is "Yes," please answer Question 6. If your answer to
17	Question 5 is "No," do not answer any further questions. Please have the Jury Foreperson sign
18	and date this Verdict Form and return it to Ms. Karen Hom.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

27

28

6.	Comparative Fault: Do you find that SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP has proved
	by a preponderance of the evidence that 1031 Advance's negligence was a substantial
	factor in causing harm to 1031 Advance?

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

If your answer to Question 6 is "Yes," please answer Question 7. If your answer to Question 6 is "No," do not answer any further questions. Please have the Jury Foreperson sign and date this Verdict Form and return it to Ms. Karen Hom.

## Case 3:10-cv-04864-JCS Document 228 Filed 09/12/13 Page 8 of 8

		7. What percentage of responsibility for 1031 Advance's harm do you assign to:
	1	7. What percentage of responsibility for 1031 Advance's narm do you assign to.
	2	SILICON VALLEY LAW GROUP%
	3	1031 ADVANCE, INC%
	4	
	5	
	6 7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
	11	
В	12	
Court	13	
trict f Cal	14	
ss Dis trict c	15	
United States District Court Northern District of California	16	DATE SIGNATURE OF FOREPERSON
nited rther	17	
$\sum_{i=1}^{N}$	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	
	<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	
	27	
	28	